THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.RAMANA

Writ Petition No.22604 of 1996

Dated: 31st January, 2006

Between:

K.S.Narayana

…..PETITIONER

AND

A.P. State Road Transport Corportion

Ltd., rep by its Managing Director,

Musheerabad, Hyderabad & 2 others.

….RESPONDENTS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE

N.V.RAMANA

W.P.No.22604 of 1996

ORDER:

This writ petition questions the inaction of the respondents in terminating the service of the petitioner without conducting any enquiry and in not considering his case for

the post of Conductor in pursuance of the Circular No.PD/92/85, dated 23-7-1985 and circulars issued from time to time and consequently to direct the respondents that the petitioner is entitled for all benefits.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for A.P.S.R.T.C.

Learned Standing Counsel for A.P.S.R.T.C submitted that the Circular No. PD/92/85 dated 23-7-1985 under which the petitioner is seeking benefit was cancelled by a subsequent circular in Circular No. PD-17/1986 dated 5-2-1986 and the Division Bench of this Court dismissed the similar matter in W.P.No.8469 of 1995 seeking benefit under Circular No.PD/92/85 dated 23-7-1985.

Above submission of the learned Standing Counsel for A.P.S.R.T.C is placed on record and the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

_____

(N.V. RAMANA, J.)

Date: 31st February, 2005.

GRK

The facts in a nutshell can be narrated as under.

Petitioner served the corporation as casual conductor since 7-4-1984 to June, 1984 and his service was terminated without issuing any charge sheet and without conducting any enquiry on the ground that he was involved in financial irregularities. Petitioner made representations and one such representation is dated

8-11-1989 to the Senior Traffic Inspector which was forwarded to the 3rd respondent and he also made an appeal on 14-5-1990 to the

2nd respondent, but in vain. Similar persons like petitioner were regularized by the respondents in pursuance of the circular dated 23-7-1985. Petitioner made another representation dated 3-7-1996, but in vain. Hence this writ petition.

In the counter affidavit filed by the respondents at para 5 it is stated that the claim of the petitioner to consider his case as per Circular No. PD-92/1985 dated 23-7-1985 is not maintainable inasmuch as the said circular was cancelled by a subsequent Circular No.PD-17/1986 dated 5-2-1986 and it was clearly decided in W.P.No.8469 of 1995 by the Division Bench of this Court wherein the Division Bench has dismissed the writ petition.